

# Patterns of Intelligence

## CHAPTER 33

### ONE ANSWER OF EVOLUTIONISTS

What is talked about in this chapter was briefly mentioned above, but this chapter will expand on what was said above.

Aside from ignoring the statistical issues of DNA, let us talk about the main answer of evolutionists to the above statistical problems.

First, let us repeat the key question: "Where do new sequences (i.e. permutations) of DNA come from?"

The claim of evolutionists is that the creation of DNA was a process which took millions of years and happened very, very, very gradually.

One of the additional claims of some evolutionists is that new DNA sequences came from two different species (i.e. a male from one species and a female from a very closely related species), which had similar, but yet slightly different DNA structures.

When a male of one of these species mated with a female of the other species; the claim is that new, intelligent DNA was created which was a mixture of both of their DNA.

This is an attempt to avoid having to explain how random mutations could create a new species.

But how can "new" DNA sequences be created from two "old" DNA sequences?

Perhaps a better way to say that is this: **"How can new 'genetic intelligence' result from the union of two species, neither of which had that specific 'genetic intelligence' on their DNA?"**

Let me repeat that because it is central to the discussion:

**"How can new 'genetic intelligence' (on DNA) result from the union of two species, neither of which had that specific 'genetic intelligence' on their DNA?"**

For example, if neither of the species which mated had claws (assume this was before the first animal with claws existed), why would you expect that the "offspring" of these two closely related species would have claws?

Where did the DNA sequences, necessary to make claws, come from when neither parent had these sequences?

New claws would require new genetic intelligence, such as entirely new sections of DNA, such as new genes, plus very sophisticated modifications to the "morphing of the embryo" algorithms (all changes to the morphing of the embryo algorithms must be "very sophisticated").

**So where did these new DNA sections, to make the claws, come from when neither the male nor female of the two closely related "parent" species had these DNA sections?**

The predictable answer of evolutionists is that the first "claws" were very small and it took many different instances of two difference species mating to create the large claws which exist on many animals today. Let me call it "incredibly gradual" evolution.

There are many problems with this theory. This theory makes their "missing link" problems (i.e. thinking about the fossil evidence for evolution) far worse than they are today because there would be many more "missing links" than they currently think exist (if evolution worked in this way).

But rest assured, the fossil record does not fit their "incredibly gradual" theory. Nor do computer simulations support this theory.

For example, if you had two computer programs which did not even remotely have an algorithm to calculate "pi" (i.e. 3.1416...), but yet both programs did some mathematical calculations, and they were "gradually" merged together, over 20 or 30 different partial mutations to the programs, would you really expect to end up with a computer program which could calculate pi to one billion digits?

All of the problems mentioned above, such as the "location" issue and the Axiom of Random Mutations, would simply be spread out into multiple occurrences if it took multiple, gradual generations!! This is because *each of the generations* would be exposed to **all of the issues** discussed in prior chapters, even if only making partial mutations in each "generation."

Spreading out the making of claws into multiple species makes things much worse because the mathematical problems discussed above occur multiple times for each partial species!!

Plus, the male/female issues discussed above would occur in each partial species!!

Also, when two different species mate, which have very similar DNA, there are only two possible outcomes, [based on actual observations of scientists](#):

First, the child of the different species cannot survive.

Second, the child of the different species can survive, but they cannot have offspring because they are infertile (e.g. the mule).

Either of these cases would terminate the creation of the "new species" immediately.

I personally have never heard of two different species (i.e. two species which had different DNA structures, using my definitions) which were able to mate and have offspring which could have their own offspring; much less millions of pairs of such species (yes, each complex species would need a male and female if it was to survive).

But the biggest problem with this "theory" is that it does not explain how new features of a new species, such as claws, came to exist. Spreading it out simply compounds the mathematical problems multiple times.

There are millions of unique features among the millions of different species on this planet. The claim that "closely related" species mated cannot explain where a single one of these features came from [if neither of the closely related species had this feature before they mated](#).